

Federal District Petition

1:18-cv-105

Gordon J. Quist - US District Judge

## UNITED STATES DIS

for the  
Western District of Michigan

FILED - LN

January 30, 2018 3:03 PM

CLERK OF COURT

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

BY clw / CLW SCANNED BY CLW 1/31

Robert Wayne Sigsby

Petitioner

vs.

Rick Snyder, d/b/a RICK SNYDER,  
 acting as GOVERNOR of  
 MICHIGAN as a man,  
 Ruth Johnson, d/b/a RUTH JOHNSON,  
 acting as SECONDARY OF STATE of  
 MICHIGAN as a woman,  
 Lynne M. Buday, d/b/a LYNNE M. BUDAY,  
 acting as JUDGE of  
 KALKASKA Co. as a woman,  
 Pat Whiteford, d/b/a PAT WHITEFORD,  
 acting as SHERIFF of  
 KALKASKA Co. As a man,  
 Mike Perreault, d/b/a MIKE PERREAU,LT,  
 acting as PROSECUTOR of  
 KALKASKA Co. as a man,  
 Gary A. Owen, d/b/a GARY A OWEN,  
 acting as SHERIFF DEPUTY of  
 KALKASKA Co. as a man,  
 Ryan Ziegler, d/b/a RYAN ZIEGLER,  
 acting as ASSISTANCE PROSECUTOR of  
 KALKASKA Co. as a man,  
 Michael Buchanan d, d/b/a MICHAEL BUCHANAN,  
 acting as COMMISSIONER of  
 KALKASKA Co. as a man,  
 George J. Mertz, d/b/a GEORGE J. MERTZ,  
 acting as CHIEF JUDGE of  
 KALKASKA Co. as a man,

§ Cause No.: 17-22231-ST-2

§ Lynne M. Buday, d/b/a  
§ JUDGE: LYNNE M. BUDAY§ Complaint for violation of  
§ Constitutional rights  
§ 42 USC 1983

§ Demand for Jury Trial

## Federal District Petition

Deborah Hill, d/b/a DEBORAH HILL,	§
acting as COUNTY CLERK of	§
KALKASKA Co. as a woman,	§
John J. Gleason, d/b/a JOHN J. GLEASON,	§
acting as COUNTY CLERK of	§
GENESEE Co. as a man,	§
NORTHERN CREDIT BUREAU and sundries,	§
acting as KALKASKA Co. collection agent,	§
<u>unknown DNR officer.</u>	§
Respondents	§

---

Jurisdiction

The Federal District Courts have Jurisdiction to hear 1983 claims under 28 USC 1343, see Meher versus Gagne 448 U.S. 122, 129 nill (1980), Federal District Courts have original Jurisdiction over 1983 claims only when substantive Right allegedly violated is secured by the Constitution or Federal laws and statutes providing for Civil Rights. Also see, Chapman versus Houston welfare R.O., 441 U.S. 600, 602-03 (1979), Federal District Courts have original Jurisdiction over 1983 claims. Pretrial detainees nor prisoners filing a Federal Court may not satisfy a jurisdictional monetary amount, nor exhaust all available state court remedies. See, 28USC 1331; USC 1343 (A.) (3.) (4.). Also see USC title 18 § 241 conspiracy against rights.

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured— see also,

18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law: "Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than

Federal District Petition

ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap,..." See also,

18 U.S. Code § 912 - Officer or employee of the United States:

"Whoever falsely assumes or pretends to be an officer or employee acting under the authority of the United States or any department, agency or officer thereof, and acts as such, or in such pretended character demands or obtains any money, paper, document, or thing of value, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 742; Pub. L. 103-322, title XXXIII, § 330016(1)(H), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2147.) See also,

42 U.S. Code § 1985 - Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights.

(3)DEPRIVING PERSONS OF RIGHTS OR PRIVILEGES.

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws; or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from giving or securing to all persons within such State or Territory the equal protection of the laws; or if two or more persons conspire to prevent by force, intimidation, or threat, any citizen who is lawfully entitled to vote, from giving his support or advocacy in a legal manner, toward or in favor of the election of any lawfully qualified person as an elector for President or Vice President, or as a Member of Congress of the United States; or to injure any citizen in person or property on account of such support or advocacy; in any case of conspiracy set forth in this section, if one or more persons engaged therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators."

(R.S. § 1980.) See also,

18 U.S. Code § 2382 - Misprision of treason

"Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same to the President or to some judge of the United States, or to the governor or to some judge or justice of a particular State, is guilty of misprision of treason and shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both."

(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 807; Pub. L. 103-322, title XXXIII, § 330016(1)(H), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2147.)

In *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 546 (1949), The Supreme Court articulated an exception to the final judgment rule for judgments that "finally determine claims of right separable from, and collateral to, the main asserted in the action that are too important to be denied review and too independent of the case itself to require that appellate consideration be deferred until the whole case is adjudicated." Title 42 USC Sec. 1983, and Sec. 1986 and established the right to sue anyone who violates your constitutional rights.

## Federal District Petition

The Constitution guarantees: he who would unlawfully jeopardize your property loses property to you, and that's what justice is all about. "Judges are deemed to know the law and are sworn to uphold it and can hardly claim that they acted in good faith for willful deformation of a law and certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, for that would make the law look unintelligent for a knowledgeable judge to claim ignorance of a law, when a citizen on the street cannot claim ignorance of the law. Therefore, there is no judicial immunities." Absolute immunity under 1983 is derived from common-law immunity available in 1871, and at common law there was no immunities for denial of privacy pursuant to the fourth Amendment (Olmstead vs. U.S., 277 U.S. 438, 478, 1928), personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction and pretrial hearing, procedural due process and substantive due process, equal protection of the law and to exercise the enjoyment of the secured liberty interest to travel under the private conveyance of common law and assaulting the accused with public star chamber trials "Camera Stellata" along with the UCC, therefore, whenever a person wears a cloak of immunity and conspires with others to deprive any person of a constitutional right that cloak is nothing but tapestry. Additional, all federal courts have the power to issue all writs necessary to ensure substantial justice. See also, 28 USC 1651 (a). Petitioner's right to the relief sought is clear and indisputable. The Supreme Court has said that absolute immunity is unavailable for states judges that "arrives at a conclusion opposite that reached by the Supreme Court on a question of law" or "decides a case differently than the Supreme Court has a set of material indistinguishable facts." Williams B. Taylor, 529 U.S. 362, 412-13, 120 S. Ct. 1495, 146 L. Ed. 2d. 389 (2000).

This 42 USC 1983 lawsuit is subject to the requirements of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA"), Pub. L. No. 104-132, 110 Stat. 1214 (1996) (codified in various sections of 28 USC) Lindh v. Murphy, 521 U.S. 320, 336, 117 S. Ct. 2059, 138 L. Ed. 2d. 481 (1997); Williams vs. Coyle, 167 F. 3d. 1036, 1040 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999). Petitioner realizes that under ("AEDPA"), a writ may not be granted unless the state courts adjudication of the claim: (1.) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by Supreme Court of United States; (2.) Resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of evidence presented in the state proceedings. With the above standards in mind, that officers and judges of a court have no immunity from liability and punishment when violating a person's constitutional rights, petitioner now turns to this issue in this lawsuit.

### Addresses and Profiles of the Respondents

1. Rick Snyder, d/b/a RICK SNYDER, acting as GOVERNOR of MICHIGAN as a man, address: 111 S. Capital Ave., Lansing, Mi. [48909].

Federal District Petition

2. Ruth Johnson, d/b/a RUTH JOHNSON,  
acting as SECRETARY OF STATE of MICHIGAN as a woman, address: Michigan  
Department of State, Lansing, Michigan. [48918]
3. Lynne M. Buday, d/b/a LYNNE M. BUDAY, acting as JUDGE of  
KALKASKA Co. as a woman, address: 605 N. Birch St., Kalkaska, Mi. [49646]
4. Pat Whiteford, d/b/a PAT WHITEFORD, acting as SHERIFF of  
KALKASKA Co. As a man, address: 605 N. Birch St., Kalkaska, Mi. [49646]
5. Mike Perreault, d/b/a MIKE PERREAU, acting as PROSECUTOR of  
KALKASKA Co. as a man, 605 N. Birch St., Kalkaska, Mi. [49646]
6. Gary A. Owen, d/b/a GARY A OWEN, acting as SHERIFF DEPUTY of  
KALKASKA Co. as a man, address: 605 N. Birch St., Kalkaska, Mi. [49646]
7. Ryan Ziegler, d/b/a RYAN ZIEGLER, acting as ASSISTANCE PROSECUTOR of  
KALKASKA Co. as a man, address: 605 N. Birch St., Kalkaska, Mi. [49646]
8. Michael Buchanan d, d/b/a MICHAEL BUCHANAN, acting as COMMISSIONER of  
KALKASKA Co. as a man, address: 605 N. Birch St., Kalkaska, Mi. [49646]
9. George J. Mertz, d/b/a GEORGE J. MERTZ, acting as CHIEF JUDGE of  
KALKASKA Co. as a man, address: 605 N. Birch St., Kalkaska, Mi. [49646]
10. Deborah Hill, d/b/a DEBORAH HILL, acting as COUNTY CLERK of  
KALKASKA Co. as a woman, address: 605 N. Birch St., Kalkaska, Mi. [49646]
11. John J. Gleason, d/b/a JOHN J. GLEASON, acting as COUNTY CLERK of  
GENESEE Co. as a man, address: 900 Saginaw St., #202. Flint, Mi. [48502]
12. NORTHERN CREDIT BUREAU and sundries, acting as KALKASKA Co. collection  
agent, address: PO Box 478, Petoskey, Mi. [49770] telephone number 231-347-2562.  
Account number: 130032
13. unknown DNR officer.

Federal District Petition

Issues presented

1. The Petitioner to whom is in the “private sector” Black’s laws Dictionary sixth Edition, Page. 1195. And is without the UNITED STATES[28 USC 1746(1)]: and was denied the liberty to the free enjoyment to travel under the private conveyance of common law as the petitioner is relying on many Supreme Court rulings and have renounced any fraudulent contracts with the state or otherwise for lack of disclosure from any “stranger” from the private sector or the public sector.

Petitioner says: yes  
Respondent says: no

2. The state MICHIGAN/KALKASKA has denied The right to enjoy the petitioners privacy to the maxim pursuant to the fourth Amendment (Olmstead vs. U.S., 277 U.S. 438, 478, 1928)

Petitioner says: yes  
Respondent says: stands mute

3. The right to enjoy Personal jurisdiction and subject matter jurisdiction.

Petitioner says: yes  
Respondent says: no

4. the right to enjoy non-consent to be governed.

Petitioner says: yes  
Respondent says: no

Argument

TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE THE UNDERSIGNED Common Law People, I am the living soul of a man upon the land Robert Wayne Sigsby, surname, sui juris, noble, without the UNITED STATES/STATE OF MICHIGAN, [28 USC 1746(1)]: c/o 2251 Glade St., Burton, Michigan state non domestic hereby Certifies, by retaining all Rights and remedies Secured unalienable rights under provisions of the Constitution of the united States of America, the Constitution of the several states, Common Law, Nature and Laws of Nature and Laws of Natures GOD, Nunc pro tunc that these inherent Rights are retained in FEE SIMPLE ABSOLUTE, and held and protected with special regard to Rights designated and/or set forth as follows:

Federal District Petition

ALSO NOTE "Rights and Property are ONE AND THE SAME THING"-by the Honorable Justice LOUIS BRANDIS U.S. SUPREME COURT.

NOTICE AND ADVISORY OF RIGHTS CLAIMED INVIOLATE: autonomy of the living soul to claim the extra-ordinary writ of habeas corpus to exercise and enjoy the great writ of liberty: The Right to TRAVEL FREELY, UNENCUMBERED, and UNFETTERED is guaranteed as RIGHT and not a mere privilege. That the Right to TRAVEL is such a BASIC RIGHT it does NOT even need to be mentioned for it is SELF-evident by Common Sense that the Right to TRAVEL is a BASIC CONCOMMITANT of a FREE Society to come and go from length and breath FREELY UNENCUMBERED and UNFETTERED distinguishes the characteristic required for a FREE PEOPLE TO EXIST IN FACT. Please See SHAPIRO vs. THOMPSON, 394 U.S. 618. "Further, the Right to TRAVEL by private conveyance for private purposes upon the Common way can NOT BE INFRINGED. No license or permission is required for TRAVEL when such TRAVEL IS NOT for the purpose of [COMMERCIAL] PROFIT OR GAIN on the open highways operating under license IN COMMERCE. The above named Common Law Citizen listed IS NOT OPERATING IN COMMERCE and as such is thereby EXEMPTED FROM THE REQUIREMENT OF A LICENSE AS SUCH". Further, MICHIGAN STATE, is FOREBIDDEN BY LAW from converting a BASIC RIGHT into a PRIVILEGE and requiring a LICENSE and or FEE CHARGED for exercise of the BASIC RIGHT. Please SEE MURDOCK vs. PENNSYLVANIA, 319 U.S. 105,

And, if MICHIGAN STATE, does ERRONIOUSLY covert BASIC RIGHTS into PRIVILEGES and require a License or FEE a Citizen may IGNORE THE LICENSE OR FEE WITH TOTAL IMMUNITY FOR SUCH EXERCISE OF A BASIC RIGHT. Please see Schuttlesworth vs. BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA, 373 U.S. 262.

Now if a Citizen exercises a BASIC RIGHT and a Law of ANY state is to the contrary of such exercise of that BASIC RIGHT, the said supposed Law of ANY state is a FICTION OF LAW and 100% TOTALLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL and NO COURTS ARE BOUND TO UPHOLD IT AND NO Citizen is REQUIRED TO OBEY SUCH UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW OR LICENSE REQUIREMENT. Please see MARBURY vs. MADISON, 5 U. S. 137 (1803), which has never been overturned in over 215 years, see Shephard's Citations, and see 16 Jur. 2d subsection 256,

Now further, if a Citizen relies in good faith on the advice of Counsel and or on the Decisions of the UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT that Citizen has a PERFECT DEFENSE to the element of WILLFULNESS and since the burden of proof of said WILLFULNESS is on the Prosecution to prove beyond a REASONABLE DOUBT, said task or burden being totally impossible to specifically perform there is NO CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WHICH RELEIF MAY BE GRANTED BY A COURT OF LAW. Please see U. S. vs. Bishop 412 U.S. 346.

OBVIOUSLY THERE IS NO LAWFUL CHARGE AGAINST EXERCISING A BASIC Right to TRAVEL for a regular Common Law Citizen NOT IN COMMERCE on the common way Public HIGHWAY, THAT IS THE LAW!!! The above named Citizen is IMMUNE FROM ANY CHARGE TO THE CONTRARY AND ANY PARTY MAKING SUCH CHARGE

Federal District Petition

**SHOULD BE DULY WARNED OF THE TORT OF TRESPASS!!! YOU ARE TRESPASSING**  
 ON THIS Common Law People!!! Any traffic ticket that is issued is a bill of attainder and are outlawed in the United States Constitution article 1 section 9 and 10 and in the Michigan state Constitution no bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be made. Pursuant to corpus delicti if there is no injured party there is no crime and the State cannot be the victim and Nisi Prius, The basis of all law, "courts rely on statute which is fiction of law which seeks to control the behavior of the sovereign people who are under common law and not statutes and who ordained and established the law therefore legislators cannot legislate the behavior of the people. See also "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation that would abrogate them." (Miranda versus Arizona 384 U.S. 436, 491)

The original and Judicial jurisdiction of the united States of America Supreme Court is ALL actions in which a State may be party, thru subdivision, political or trust. This includes ALL state approved subdivisions and/or INCORPORATED Cities, Townships, Municipalities, and Villages, Et Al. Please see Article 3, Section 1 and 2, Para. (1), U.S. Constitution.

The undersigned has NEVER willingly and knowingly entered into ANY Contract or Contractual agreement, ( All contracts commence with an offer and only become binding upon acceptance. "See: Farnsworth on Contracts, ©2004 by E. Allen Farnsworth, Third Edition, Aspen Publishers, ISBN: 9780735541429 (vol.1).") giving up ANY Constitutional Rights which are secured by the CONSTITUTION, the SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. This Common Law Citizen has not harmed any party, has NOT threatened any party, and that includes has NOT threatened or caused any endangerment to the safety or well being of any party and would leave any claimant otherwise to their strictest proofs otherwise IN A COURT OF LAW. The above named Citizen is merely exercising the BASIC RIGHT TO TRAVEL UNENCUMBERED and UNFETTERED on the Common public way or highway, which is their RIGHT TO SO DO!!! Please see Zobel vs. Williams, 457 U. S. 55, held the RIGHT TO TRAVEL is Constitutionally PROTECTED!!

Conversion of the RIGHT TO TRAVEL into a PRIVILEGE and or CRIME is A FRAUD a "lawful Maxim" and is in clear and direct conflict with the united states of America CONSTITUTION, THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. LAWS made by any state, which are clearly in direct CONFLICT or REPUGNANCY are UNCONSTITUTIONAL and are NOTWITHSTANDING IN LAW AND ARE BEING CHALLENGED AS SUCH HERE AND THEREBY ARE NULL AND VOID OF LAW ON THEIR FACE. NO COURTS ARE BOUND TO UPHOLD SUCH FICTIONS OF LAW AND NO Citizen is bound to obey such a FICTION OF LAW. SUCH REGULATION OR LAW OPERATES AS A MERE NULLITY OR FICTION OF LAW AS IF IT NEVER EXISTED IN LAW. NO CITIZEN IS BOUND TO OBEY SUCH UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW!!!! "The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, whether federal or state though having the form and name of law is in reality no law but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose,...The general principle stated above applies to the Constitution as well as laws of the several states in so far as they are repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States." (16 American jurisprudence 2d. Section 256.) "If the Constitution prescribes one rule and the statute another in a different rule, it is the duty of the court to declare that the Constitution and not the statute governs in the case before them for judgment." (16 American jurisprudence 2d section 155.)

Federal District Petition

The payment for a privilege requires a benefit to be received As the RIGHT TO TRAVEL is already secured it is clearly unlawful to cite any charges without direct damage to the specific party. Nor may a Citizen be charged with an offense for the exercise of a CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, in this case the RIGHT TO TRAVEL. Please see Miller vs. UNITED STATES 230 F2d 486. Nor may a Citizen be denied DUE PROCESS OF LAW or EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW.

The undersigned does hereby claim, declare, and certify ANY AND ALL their CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS INVIOLATE from GOD and secured in the united States of America's CONSTITUTION and the CONSTITUTION OF THE state wherein they abode as a SOVEREIGN, COMMON LAW LIVING MAN existing and acting entirely AT THE COMMON LAW and retains ALL BASIC RIGHTS under the CONSTITUTION OF THE United States of America, pursuant to the laws of NATURE AND NATURE'S GOD AND UNDER THE LAWS OF GOD THE SUPREME LAW GIVER universal Creator of the universe. See also,

ANY VIOLATOR OF THE ABOVE CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE AND CLAIM IS CRIMINALLY TRESPASSING UPON THIS ABOVE NAMED COMMON LAW LIVING MAN AND WILL BE PROSECUTED TO THE FULLEST EXTENT UNDER THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. BE WARNED OF THE TRESPASS AND IGNORANCE OF THE LAW IS NOT AN EXCUSE!! U.S. SUPREME COURT AND OTHER HIGH COURT CITATIONS PROVING THAT NO LICENSE IS NECESSARY FOR NORMAL USE OF AN AUTOMOBILE ON COMMON WAYS. See also,

"The right of a citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, by horsedrawn carriage, wagon, or automobile, is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but a common right which he has under his right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Under this constitutional guaranty one may, therefore, under normal conditions, travel at his inclination along the public highways or in public places, and while conducting himself in an orderly and decent manner, neither interfering with nor disturbing another's rights, he will be protected, not only in his person, but in his safe conduct."

Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579, 11 American Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, section 329, page 1135. See also,

"The right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, is a common right which he has under the right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety. It includes the right, in so doing, to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day, and under the existing modes of travel, includes the right to drive a horse drawn carriage or wagon thereon or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purpose of life and business." —Thompson vs. Smith, *supra*; *Teche Lines vs. Danforth*, Miss., 12 S.2d 784. See also,

"...the right of the citizen to drive on a public street with freedom from police interference... is a fundamental constitutional right" -White, 97 Cal.App.3d.141, 158 Cal. Rptr. 562, 566-67 (1979)

Federal District Petition

“citizens have a right to drive upon the public streets of the District of Columbia or any other city absent a constitutionally sound reason for limiting their access.”Caneisha Mills v. D.C. 2009. See also,

“The use of the automobile as a necessary adjunct to the earning of a livelihood in modern life requires us in the interest of realism to conclude that the RIGHT to use an automobile on the public highways partakes of the nature of a liberty within the meaning of the Constitutional guarantees. . .”Berberian v. Lussier (1958) 139 A2d 869, 872, See also: Schecter v. Killingsworth, 380 P.2d 136, 140; 93 Ariz. 273 (1963). See also,

“The right to operate a motor vehicle [an automobile] upon the public streets and highways is not a mere privilege. It is a right of liberty, the enjoyment of which is protected by the guarantees of the federal and state constitutions.”Adams v. City of Pocatello, 416 P.2d 46, 48; 91 Idaho 99 (1966). See also,

“A traveler has an equal right to employ an automobile as a means of transportation and to occupy the public highways with other vehicles in common use.”Campbell v. Walker, 78 Atl. 601, 603, 2 Boyce (Del.) 41. See also,

“The owner of an automobile has the same right as the owner of other vehicles to use the highway,\* \* \* A traveler on foot has the same right to the use of the public highways as an automobile or any other vehicle.”Simeone v. Lindsay, 65 Atl. 778, 779; Hannigan v. Wright, 63 Atl. 234, 236. See also,

“The RIGHT of the citizen to DRIVE on the public street with freedom from police interference, unless he is engaged in suspicious conduct associated in some manner with criminality is a FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT which must be protected by the courts.” People v. Horton 14 Cal. App. 3rd 667 (1971) See also,

“The right to make use of an automobile as a vehicle of travel along the highways of the state, is no longer an open question. The owners thereof have the same rights in the roads and streets as the drivers of horses or those riding a bicycle or traveling in some other vehicle.” House v. Cramer, 112 N.W. 3; 134 Iowa 374; Farnsworth v. Tampa Electric Co. 57 So. 233, 237, 62 Fla. 166. See also,

“The automobile may be used with safety to others users of the highway, and in its proper use upon the highways there is an equal right with the users of other vehicles properly upon the highways. The law recognizes such right of use upon general principles.”Brinkman v Pacholike, 84 N.E. 762, 764, 41 Ind. App. 662, 666. See also,

“The law does not denounce motor carriages, as such, on public ways. They have an equal right with other vehicles in common use to occupy the streets and roads. It is improper to say that the driver of the horse has rights in the roads superior to the driver of the automobile. Both have the right to use the easement.”Indiana Springs Co. v. Brown, 165 Ind. 465, 468. U.S. See also,

Federal District Petition

Supreme Court says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Highways/Streets  
No License Is Necessary Copy and Share Freely YHVH.name 2 2 See also,

“A highway is a public way open and free to any one who has occasion to pass along it on foot or with any kind of vehicle.” Schlesinger v. City of Atlanta, 129 S.E. 861, 867, 161 Ga. 148, 159; See also,

Holland v. Shackelford, 137 S.E. 2d 298, 304, 220 Ga. 104; Stavola v. Palmer, 73 A.2d 831, 838, 136 Conn. 670. See also,

“There can be no question of the right of automobile owners to occupy and use the public streets of cities, or highways in the rural districts.” Liebrecht v. Crandall, 126 N.W. 69, 110 Minn. 454, 456. See also,

“The word ‘automobile’ connotes a pleasure vehicle designed for the transportation of persons on highways.”-American Mutual Liability Ins. Co., vs. Chaput, 60 A.2d 118, 120; 95 NH 200 Motor Vehicle: 18 USC Part 1 Chapter 2 section 31 definitions: “(6) Motor vehicle. – The term “motor vehicle” means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways...” 10) The term “used for commercial purposes” means the carriage of persons or property for any fare, fee, rate, charge or other consideration, or directly or indirectly in connection with any business, or other undertaking intended for profit. See also,

“A motor vehicle or automobile for hire is a motor vehicle, other than an automobile stage, used for the transportation of persons for which remuneration is received.”-International Motor Transit Co. vs. Seattle, 251 P. 120. See also,

The term ‘motor vehicle’ is different and broader than the word ‘automobile.’”-City of Dayton vs. DeBrosse, 23 NE.2d 647, 650; 62 Ohio App. 232. See also,

“Thus self-driven vehicles are classified according to the use to which they are put rather than according to the means by which they are propelled” – Ex Parte Hoffert, 148 NW 20. See also,

“The Supreme Court, in Arthur v. Morgan, 112 U.S. 495, 5 S.Ct. 241, 28 L.Ed. 825, held that carriages were properly classified as household effects, and we see no reason that automobiles should not be similarly disposed of.”Hillhouse v United States, 152 F. 163, 164 (2nd Cir. 1907). See also,

“...a citizen has the right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon...” State vs. Johnson, 243 P. 1073; Cummins vs. Homes, 155 P. 171; Packard vs. Banton, 44 S.Ct. 256; Hadfield vs. Lundin, 98 Wash 516, Willis vs. Buck, 263 P. 1982; Barney vs. Board of Railroad Commissioners, 17 P.2d 82 See also,

“The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and fundamental Right of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully

Federal District Petition

deprived.”Chicago Motor Coach vs. Chicago, 169 NE 22; Ligare vs. Chicago, 28 NE 934; Boon vs. Clark, 214 SSW 607; 25 Am.Jur. (1st) Highways Sect.163. See also,

“the right of the Citizen to travel upon the highway and to transport his property thereon in the ordinary course of life and business... is the usual and ordinary right of the Citizen, a right common to all.” –Ex Parte Dickey, (Dickey vs. Davis), 85 SE 781. See also,

“Every Citizen has an unalienable RIGHT to make use of the public highways of the state; every Citizen has full freedom to travel from place to place in the enjoyment of life and liberty.” People v. Nothaus, 147 Colo. 210. See also,

“No State government entity has the power to allow or deny passage on the highways, byways, nor waterways... transporting his vehicles and personal property for either recreation or business, but by being subject only to local regulation i.e., safety, caution, traffic lights, speed limits, etc. Travel is not a privilege requiring licensing, vehicle registration, or forced insurances.”Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22. See also,

“Traffic infractions are not a crime.” People v. Battle “Persons faced with an unconstitutional licensing law which purports to require a license as a prerequisite to exercise of right... may ignore the law and engage with impunity in exercise of such right.”Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 394 U.S. 147 (1969). See also,

U.S. Supreme Court says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Highways/Streets No License Is Necessary Copy and Share Freely YHVH.name 3. See also,

“The word ‘operator’ shall not include any person who solely transports his own property and who transports no persons or property for hire or compensation.”Statutes at Large California Chapter 412 p.83. See also,

“Highways are for the use of the traveling public, and all have the right to use them in a reasonable and proper manner; the use thereof is an inalienable right of every citizen.” Escobedo v. State 35 C2d 870 in 8 Cal Jur 3d p.27. See also,

“RIGHT — A legal RIGHT, a constitutional RIGHT means a RIGHT protected by the law, by the constitution, but government does not create the idea of RIGHT or original RIGHTS; it acknowledges them. . . “ Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1914, p. 2961. See also,

“Those who have the right to do something cannot be licensed for what they already have right to do as such license would be meaningless.”City of Chicago v Collins 51 NE 907, 910. See also,

“A license means leave to do a thing which the licensor could prevent.” Blatz Brewing Co. v. Collins, 160 P.2d 37, 39; 69 Cal. A. 2d 639. See also,

“The object of a license is to confer a right or power, which does not exist without it.”Payne v. Massey (19\_\_\_\_) 196 SW 2nd 493, 145 Tex 273. See also,

Federal District Petition

“The court makes it clear that a license relates to qualifications to engage in profession, business, trade or calling; thus, when merely traveling without compensation or profit, outside of business enterprise or adventure with the corporate state, no license is required of the natural individual traveling for personal business, pleasure and transportation.” *Wingfield v. Fielder* 2d Ca. 3d 213 (1972). See also,

“If [state] officials construe a vague statute unconstitutionally, the citizen may take them at their word, and act on the assumption that the statute is void.” *–Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham* 394 U.S. 147 (1969). See also,

“With regard particularly to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that a Right secured or protected by that document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority.” *Donnolly vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co.*, 184 US 540; *Lafarier vs. Grand Trunk R.R. Co.*, 24 A. 848; *O’Neil vs. Providence Amusement Co.*, 108 A. 887. See also,

“The right to travel (called the right of free ingress to other states, and egress from them) is so fundamental that it appears in the Articles of Confederation, which governed our society before the Constitution.” *(Paul v. Virginia)*. See also,

“[T]he right to travel freely from State to State ... is a right broadly assertable against private interference as well as governmental action. Like the right of association, it is a virtually unconditional personal right, guaranteed by the Constitution to us all.” (U.S. Supreme Court, *Shapiro v. Thompson*). *EDGERTON*, Chief Judge: See also,

“Iron curtains have no place in a free world. ... ‘Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any State is a right secured by the Constitution.’ *Williams v. Fears*, 179 U.S. 270, 274, 21 S.Ct. 128, 45 L.Ed. 186. See also,

“Our nation has thrived on the principle that, outside areas of plainly harmful conduct, every American is left to shape his own life as he thinks best, do what he pleases, go where he pleases.” *Id.*, at 197. *Kent vs. Dulles* see *Vestal, Freedom of Movement*, 41 Iowa L.Rev. 6, 13—14.

I, Robert Wayne Sigsby, sovereign autonomy, do affirm that I have read the above petition and do know the contents to be true, correct, and complete, and not misleading, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth pursuant to 28 USC 1746 uncontested et. al.

Federal District Petition

Please note that defined terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to such terms in the Notice and Demand or Document to which this Affidavit is attached.

I, Robert Wayne, surname Sigsby, petitioner, a living soul of a man upon the land, upon my full unlimited commercial liability, do affirm and say that I have read the above petition and do know the contents to the very best of my knowledge to be true, correct, complete, and not misleading; the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Demand for response 28 USC 1746 uncontested et. al.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, autographed at Flint, mi. U.S.A.  
[city] [state, United States]  
on the 30 day of JAN in the Year Two Thousand and 18.  
[day] [month] [year]

R. Wayne Sigsby [autograph]

Robert Wayne Sigsby Surname, All Rights and remedies Reserved nunc pro tunc  
c/o 2251 Glade St.

Burton, Michigan state non domestic

United States of America

without the UNITED STATES/STATE OF MICHIGAN

Darryl Dale Sigsby  
Witness [autograph]

Mike G. Cox  
Witness [autograph]

Notary